The Real Error in That Erroneous Village Bombing, P. 2

Which of These Expresses the "Morally, Mentally and Emotionally" Immature View?

"DaNang, South Vietnam—FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has assured a fighting young Marine lieutenant here that anti-Vietnam demonstrators in the U.S. represent a minority 'for the most part composed of halfway citizens who are neither morally, mentally nor emotionally mature. This is true whether the demonstrator be the college professor or the beatnik.'"

—*Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Nov. 1.*

"The current anti-Vietnam war demonstrations are a 'healthy political outgrowth of ferment' that the late President Kennedy 'stirred up', former presidential aide and author Theodore C. Sorensen told 1000 students at Rosary College, River Forest. 'And I would rather have this kind of ferment on our campuses than having students interested only in football, panty raids and parties.'"

—*Chicago Daily News, Oct. 29.*

"Teachers and students are citizens, are entitled to the same freedom of expression as other citizens . . . Beyond their role as citizens, the professor and the student have a special function, recognized in the concept of academic freedom, to pursue truth and to express it to the best of their ability . . . Free discussion and full debate of domestic and foreign issues are crucial to the decision-making processes in a democratic society and may be expected to contribute to an exploration of viable options of public policy."-*American Asso. of University Professors, Oct. 29.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 37 NOVEMBER 8, 1965 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Will Brazil Some Day Be Our Algeria?

The *Washington Post* is more and more losing its editorial independence under pressure from the White House and the State Department. A scandalous example of what this can do to a liberal newspaper was its editorial Oct. 29 on the military takeover in Brazil. The less liberal but more independent *Baltimore Sun* Oct. 31 commented with acidity on Castelo Branco's claim that he was suspending the Constitution and dissolving Brazil's political parties in order to achieve "tranquillity for the nation's economic development." The *Sun* responded with a defense of democracy. "Repression," it said, "can tranquillize but hardly energize an economy." The *Washington Post,* on the other hand, published a long and fatuous defense of the Brazilian military. This faithfully reflects the line which is being handed out by the State Department and by Lincoln Gordon, who in his passionate advocacy acts like Brazil's Ambassador to Washington instead of our Ambassador to Rio.

Brazil's Workers Coddled?

"Doctrinaire reactions against the role of the military are unrealistic," said the *Washington Post.* Brazil's workers had too much "coddling" under the Goulart regime. "Brazil," it said, "was an example of a situation in which a militarily-based regime has proceeded with dedication in areas where politicians had failed." This recalls the language in which Mussolini's seizure of power in Italy was once welcomed.

"With the mammoth economic problems in Brazil and the razor balance between reform and revolution," said the *Post,* "it is especially important for Americans to have a sympathetic insight into what President Castelo Branco and his colleagues have been trying to do." A better insight into what the military have been trying to do was afforded by the stock market in Rio. The day after the decrees wiping out free government in Brazil, the market had the biggest and most bullish day in its history. Bull markets are not precipitated by agrarian reform and higher minimum wages. Democracy had to be suspended because the Castelo Branco regime is putting the burden of deflation on the backs of Brazil's poor. They not only have to bear it. Their spokesman are even forbidden to complain. The very day the *Washington Post* wrote that editorial explaining that Castelo Branco had not "interfered so far with freedom of the press", severe restrictions were being announced in Rio. Newspapers were forbidden to publish news "likely to stir the people against the government" (*Baltimore Sun* from Rio, Oct 29). Presumably this would apply to such items as the 40 percent rise in the cost of living during the first nine months of this year.

(*Continued on Page Four*)

A Triple Defeat for Rightists

In New York City, New Jersey and Virginia, the election returns were a resounding defeat for rightists. The victory of Lindsay, despite the Buckley-led Goldwaterites on his flank, was another major setback for the lunatic and crypto-Fascist fringe of the GOP. Lindsay gives New York City the hope of creative government after so many years of stale machine rule, and opens the possibility of a liberal Republican alternative to Johnson's suffocatingly Augustan age at home and increased belligerence abroad. Official Washington may well note that Lindsay (and Beame) were conspicuous by their absence from the pro-war parade in New York on the eve of the elections, and that Johnson's war stirred enthusiasm only from Buckleyites.

The shadow of the Vietnamese war also fell on the New Jersey election where the Republican Dumont made it a virtual plebiscite on freedom of speech in wartime. Dumont seized on the pro-Viet Cong declaration of one State university professor, Genovese, to stage a McCarthy-style campaign. Hughes was not afraid to pick up the challenge and his defense of free speech was rewarded by reelection with a Democratic legislature, the first since Woodrow Wilson's. In Virginia rightist elements in a Conservative third party tried unsuccessfully to defeat a Democrat with labor and Negro support. In Cleveland, in a three-cornered race, a Negro was almost elected Mayor over an incumbent Democrat.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Real Error in That Bombing Raid on A Friendly Vietnamese Village . . .

The real error in that erroneous bombing of a friendly village in South Vietnam has been overlooked in press comment and official apology. The real error is the bombardment of *any* villages, friendly or unfriendly. "To bomb a village," Roger Hilsman told the Senate refugee subcommittee Sept. 30, "even though the guerrillas are using it as a base for sniping, will recruit more Viet Cong than are killed." Hilsman resigned last year as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. "If bombing the North has been a bad mistake," Hilsman told the refugee subcommittee, "bombing the South has been a tragic one—for it has worked to alienate the people." Unfortunately too few of our military agree. Jack Langguth asked an unnamed U.S. Air Force officer in the Mekong delta how the Viet Cong could be defeated, and got this answer (*New York Times* Sunday Magazine Oct. 17): "Terror," he said pleasantly. "The Viet Cong have terrorized the peasants to get their cooperation. . . . We must terrorize the villagers even more. . . . We've got to start bombing and strafing the villagers that aren't friendly to the government"

Just When "The Tide Had Turned"

Time Magazine had hardly hit the streets with a jubilant Oct. 22 issue "The Turning Point in Vietnam" ("The Viet Cong's once-cocky hunters have become the cowering hunted") when the VC's in one week made 811 attacks, many of battalion size, and destroyed $10 million worth of aircraft at U.S. bases. The *Baltimore Sun* reported from Saigon Oct. 28 that the record high of "incidents" and the size of the attacking forces ran counter to speculation that B-52 pounding would force the VC back to small scale terrorist action. While the U.S. press made a Saigon parade in celebration of the second anniversary of Diem's overthrow the occasion for another splurge of optimism, the London *Observer* (Oct. 31) reported from Saigon rumblings of a new coup. *Time* in that Oct. 22 issue described Gen. Ky as "the closest thing to a national hero South Vietnam has" and said his "promises of social reform and a vigorous attack on corruption" have had such effect that the Buddhists "simply cannot find credible grievances that will bring crowds into the street." But Jack Foisie cabled from Saigon in the *Washington Post* (Nov. 2) that two special emissaries sent out by the White House for a fresh look, Clark Clifford and Prof. Henry Kissinger, were "returning home dismayed by the almost total lack of political maturity or unselfish political motivation they found among current or potential leaders of the South Vietnamese government." The war, we have been told again and again, is a war for the loyalty of the peasant. But they found the peasants have "little or no voice" in the government. "The Vietnamese well-to-do," Foisie wrote, "and this includes the army officer class, have what approaches a loathing for the peasant." They found graft draining away much of the aid we send for refugees. Clifford's mission is especially significant since he is chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, which is supposed to check on the CIA. Apparently the White House is not satisfied with what it gets through normal intelligence channels.

Another Viet War Mystery

Mystery envelops a unanimous report by the International Control Commission (India, Poland, Canada) condemning the South Vietnamese for repeated violations of the Cambodian border and warning that their continuation may lead to hostilities. The Commission recommended a Geneva-type conference to guarantee Cambodia's borders. The mystery is why this report, dated July 15, did not become public until now. The story broke in Moscow Oct. 28 in a Tass broadcast in English and the report was given out next day in

The Insanity Cooking Up

"Cindy Ludlum smiled pleasantly. 'It is D-day plus 30,' she said cheerfully. 'We were hit with 400 nuclear weapons on September 27. Hostilities have ceased and we are trying to get back on our feet. Would you like to come with me to the war room?'

"Her boss, Anthony A. Bertsch, stood on the deep beige carpet at one end of the conference room and pointed at a deceptively colorful illuminated map of the United States. 'As you can see from the blackboard over here our losses were only 22.5 million—extremely light.' For the 600 business men taking part in the war exercise staged by the Commerce Department's Business and Defense Services Administration, this was as close as they would ever like to come to the real thing . . . Thirty percent of the Nation's industrial plant was either destroyed or so badly damaged that it was not worth repairing . . . The word of the emergency exercise came without warning at 11:56 a.m., midway in the second day of the two-day training session which has brought more than 1400 executive reservists here to perfect the production and distribution skills they would use if the nation were attacked." —*Washington Star, Oct. 27.*

A New Respect for the Dedication and Bravery of the Viet Cong Breaks Through

"The most striking first impression of Pleime was the depth of the professional respect the Americans had for their enemy, among whom were hundreds of North Vietnamese troops. Major Beckwith [of Atlanta, the camp commander] called the attacking troops 'the finest soldiers I have ever seen in the world except Americans. I wish we could recruit them,' he said. 'I wish we knew what they were drugging them with to make them fight like that. They are highly motivated and highly dedicated'... The defenders almost took a kind of pride in the fact that bombing had not silenced the heavy machine guns of their enemy. 'Old Charlie [Vietcong] just stands up in his hole and keeps shooting back at the whole Air Force,' said one man . . .

"They [the U.S. soldiers] had not forgotten the fight on Saturday when a single Viet Cong soldier had emerged from a hole, charged two platoons of mountaineers with a hand grenade and routed them. Major Beckwith himself had fired seven bullets into the enemy's back, but he had said, 'That was a real soldier.' . . .

"In the brush, the Pleime defenders captured an assistant platoon leader of a North Vietnamese regiment who had been left behind because he was ill. He trembled but was treated kindly and given a cigarette. One American said, 'We ought to put this guy on the north wall and throw out these [South Vietnamese] government troops. He could probably hold it alone."

—*Chas. Mohr from Pleime in New York Times, Oct. 28.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . New York's Pro-War Parade Was A Rightist Pro-Buckley Demonstration

London by the Foreign Office. Here Murray Marder (*Washington Post,* Oct. 30) was the only State Department reporter to give the story the coverage it deserved. "Officially", the Department told him, the report had not yet been received in Washington, though a copy was available at the Canadian Embassy. Unanimous reports by the ICC are rare. The failure to make this report public all these months must have embittered Prince Sihanouk.

The New York Demonstrations

The press belittled New York's anti-war parade of Oct. 16 and exaggerated the sire of the pro-war parade Oct. 30. Most papers out in the country used the figure of 65,000 for the pro-war, which its backers claimed in advance; New York papers scaled this down to 25,000. Fact is that the two parades were about equal in size. "The protest parade," Rasa Gustaitis of the *New York Herald-Tribune* (Oct 31) noted in the best account, "had lasted slightly longer." Fifth Avenue was lined with a friendly crowd for the anti-war parade. "But whole blocks were empty," Miss Gustaitis noted of the pro-war parade. While the press and TV focus on beatniks in peace ranks, there was little notice taken of the fact that it was a small organized gang of young louts who ran alongside the peace parade, shouting insults and hurling eggs and paint. (I myself in the first row of the peace parade got hit with an egg, fortunately fresh.) Similar vigilante elements attacked pro-peace spectators during the pro-war parade. This was organized by the New York *Journal-American,* mobilized professional anti-Communist organizations and turned into a pro-Buckley rally. No other candidate for Mayor appeared on the reviewing stand, but Senator Javits turned up, explaining that he did so to "show my opinion," but added that this did not change his desire for negotiation, thus planting his feet firmly in both camps.

Big Brother Here, Too

The memoirs of Col. Penkovsky, "our man in the Kremlin", are being serialized in the U.S. press. Frank Gibney explained in his introduction to the second installment (*Washington Post,* Nov. 1) why this Soviet professional soldier and General Staff officer turned against his own country. Gibney said Penkovsky was "increasingly appalled by the network of spies and informers" in the Soviet Union "fully eight years after de-Stalinization had supposedly thawed Soviet society." We seem to be moving in the same direction. On NBC's "The Big Ear" program (Oct. 31) a former U.S. Army intelligence agent disclosed that he tapped Eleanor Roosevelt's private telephone conversations. A society in which snoopers spy even on a First Lady is badly infected with totalitarian attitudes. That was in 1943. Since then our gumshoe apparatus has mushroomed. There are now 12 different U.S. spy agencies represented on our U.S. Intelligence Board, with technical devices undreamed of a decade ago. The secret police are more powerful in the Soviet Union than here but the growth rate of ours seems to be faster.

War of Nerves Dept.

"The RAF and the U.S. Air Force have produced a joint target plan for all-out nuclear and conventional attacks on China should the need arise. The coordinated plan could be put into operation at short notice. Permission for its execution has to be given by the Prime Minister or the President. The plan was drawn up to avoid confusion over targets, which might have resulted in one air force destroying the other by an uncoordinated attack on the same place at the same time. It will also prevent 'over-kills' of targets and will mean that no target is overlooked by both countries . . . The sort of situation that would trigger it off would be Chinese intervention against either Vietnam or India. This would mean instant retaliation by Britain or America, or both. Whether nuclear or high explosive weapons were used would depend on the sort of attack made by China."

—London Daily Telegraph, Oct. 18.

British Press Reports Out of China Support Japanese Rather Than U.S. Views

The Communist Chinese recently took a group of English writers on a junket to Peking. Their reports are beginning to appear in the British press. These seem to agree on the whole with the Japanese rather than the official U.S. position on China. The contrasting views were presented in a debate at Arden House last week-end by Wm. P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, with Dr. Matsumoto, of Tokyo's International House. The former pictured Peking as irretrievably expansionist and warlike. The latter insisted that we take the belligerent statements of its leaders too seriously, that they are primarily concerned with internal development.

This is also the impression in the first three British reports we have seen: in the London Times (Oct. 26); in the Manchester Guardian (Washington Post, Oct. 28) and by Hugh Trevor-Roper in the London Sunday Times (Oct. 31). Trevor-Roper's report, the most critical of the three, reflects the boredom of the foreign visitor deluged by the interminable propaganda in China, and by its smugness and parochialism. But he finds the comparison with Hitler Germany unfair: "The basic note of aggression is lacking." He ends by predicting that the fanaticism and puritanism, like that of the Bolsheviks, will give way to more comfortable co-existence policies "if capitalism in the rest of Asia is detached from 'colonialism'." This is an important if.

In Russia, revolutionary intransigeance began to die out with internal improvement and national security. "So long as Peking does nothing rash," the London Times reported, "the days of civil war and famine seem finally to be over. Peasants and workers are guaranteed some kind of minimal subsistence level, and this is an enormous improvement on pre-1949 days." U.S. policy hates to admit that Communism can work and our hard-liners are as unwilling as Peking's to practice co-existence in Asia.

The Manchester Guardian's reporter was "struck by the absence" in China of "the appalling squalor and poverty" in India and Indonesia. Unless we can help end that poverty, we may find ourselves fighting more Vietnams. "If the people of India, or Pakistan, or Burma," Senator Robert F. Kennedy said in a thoughtful plea for a much greater foreign aid effort in New York City Oct. 22, "do not believe their system is worth fighting for, each new crisis" will raise for us the question of military intervention. This, the Senator said, would be "terribly costly in the lives of our young men." And of a wider conflagration in Asia. This is why Japan fears Peking's tough talk less than our ideological rigidity and military reflexes.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brazil's Military Consider Its No. 1 Social Reformer Their No. 1 Enemy

(*Continued from Page One*)

despite the sacrifices imposed on wage-earners in the name of stopping inflation. Newspapers were also forbidden to publish statements by persons who have had their political rights taken away from them by the military, persons like former President Kubitschek.

The Real Father of The Alliance for Progress

To focus on Kubitschek is to light up what is happening in Brazil. The Alliance for Progress really originated in Kubitschek's proposal two years earlier for an Operation Pan America. Under his presidency 1956-60, Brazil had one of the greatest periods of development in its history. Its growth rate was about double its rate of population increase. Though this was accompanied by the galloping inflation endemic in Latin America, the benefits of prosperity were widely shared. It is revealing that today Kubitschek is the No. 1 target of the Brazilian military. He has been deprived of political rights and subjected to constant interrogation at the expense of his health. It was the victory of his party in five of the recent gubernatorial elections which led the military to suspend the Constitution, and to forbid the press to publish anything he might say. The man who comes closest to being Brazil's hope for leadership in the direction of democratic and peaceful reform is regarded as No. 1 enemy by the military we support. Our primary concern under Johnson and Mann is not social change for the benefit of the masses as envisaged by Kennedy but the maintenance, by force if necessary, of what is called a favorable climate for U.S. investment in Brazil. Such climates, though made favorable today, risk being paid for by an explosive popular resentment tomorrow.

Another primary concern of the Johnson-Mann era is to maintain in power in Brazil the one major military force in the hemisphere on which we can count for such joint operations as our recent intervention in the Dominican Republic. There is something risible about a crusade to make the Western Hemisphere safe for democracy when its chief supporters with our approval set up a military dictatorship in their own country.

All this merits more than a casual glance as if at a distant error of policy. What if the military in Brazil were to be confronted by a mass uprising for the restoration of democratic liberties? What if the military were to split, as they did in the Dominican Republic and one faction to fight for restoration of the Constitution? What if Castelo Branco and his hard-line Army Chief of Staff, Costa e Silva, were in danger of being overthrown? Would we be asked to intervene in their defense? Would another Communist menace be conjured up, with the names and addresses of 57 agitators? Would we be told that American lives and property were in danger? Whether in Brazil or elsewhere in Latin America, future crises of this sort can easily be envisaged. The time to think about them is now before they happen. "After Indochina," a U.S. Special Forces lieutenant in Vietnam told the French novelist Jean Lartéguy (*Paris Match*, Oct 16), "we will have our Algeria. It will be South America." It could some day cost a lot of American lives to try and undo what our military proteges are now doing in Brazil.

Alliance for Militarism—Not Progress

"News of the seizure of dictatorial power by the Brazilian military junta marks a disastrous reversal for liberty in Latin America. What is even worse is the continuation of American financial backing for such a regime. By so doing we are transforming the Alliance for Progress into an alliance for progressive militarism in the Western hemisphere. The semantics from Washington and from the Brazilian cabal, seeking to allay fears for democratic institutions in that great nation, will not fool any but those who want to be fooled.

"Abolition of political parties, suspension of legislative acts, destruction of constitutional rights, and rule by the fiat of those who seized power by force in the first place are hallmarks of totalitarianism. They look no better when they are supported by the U.S. in Brazil than when they are supported by the Soviet Union in Cuba. This military dictatorship in Brazil will in fact be a great aid to Communism to the south, for Communism has always fared best under military dictatorships. We will not restore the true intent of the Alliance for Progress until we restore the policy of the Kennedy Administration of suspending financial aid to coup governments."

—Wayne Morse (D.-Oregon), Oct. 29.

We Deeply Appreciate The Diligence of Readers Who Send Us Clippings from Their Local Papers

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

11/8/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED